

(Pens)

Feb 27
Tobys

MISC

To an unusual
degree, as a child
I was unable to
tell the difference
between what "I"
"want" wanted and
what she wants ^{by} to
want and therefore
wanted.

WRITES COMMENTS TO
IWAMATSU

2 March 94
after 3 days

(Milgram:

all fours under
group behavior, (≥ 3)
typical dyadic
relationship with
subject:

absent

conformity

proxim/contact

(no dyadic reaction)

or simple egoism

fear of retribution;

shame, consciousness,

distress; no of giving too

-Dropping was
over-determined; there
multiple motions,
converging; and most
of those for it, showed
little evidence of
"scruples," "misgivings"
[except: Oppie
dist, soon afterwards:
like Sybil, w. japon
(not, man).]

NSC NPR: Bill (CNPT
also through / average!)
Coyens + others 26 Feb 94

Frank van Haaften

- Russia says
verbal may not
be enough any more;
(Want written?)

"OVERALL DEAL: FAIR"
Object - giving pressure;

/// (GIVE UP
ugly " TO ~~SAK~~
RUSSIA)

Agrees: 3500 ("only,
more" Van Haaften? "I
can't say.")

is not a real option:
except as states goes.

(One: "Fair Punishing, it's best
exit the to less than 3500")

~~WE -~~

- writer below

synchronous

wake-ups? background?

(loss? of insightful,
inside, empathetic
analysis)

Dunn, McCandliss, Butterfield

in his various
self-explanations

Crazier to dad
told - to Dad said
"I'm sorry you
asked..." "Why did
& say that?" Well,
& was

assaults & can't
enter & of intruder



(Refer)

- Gordon H. Chang
Friends at厄運
(Taiwan 台灣
crisis) 1948-72
Stepford

- Bruce Cumings
Origins of the
Korean War Vol. II
UC Press \$20
Cornell

- Silver cup paper

~~Security~~

18 Aug 94



Saint Corp

reaction of secrecy

multiple, conflicting

solidarities

loyalties

recruiter, associations

(loyalty, donor

betrayal

A "betrayal" is both

a betrayal of...

one " " with, for, to

A traitor is... gross

with

autonomy
self; resistance for (a time)
antibiotic should

fig 23 Sat

W&XOST

*/irradiation

- Connect Oppie / & two
etc.
would to prep

bending a track

by side-tracking,
"stiffen" the French
Report and by lateral
partition, and silencing
discreet.

- as if the card a lot
about dropping bomb (for
the reasons: not, Russia)

Pat

Ken Huong

586-2117

- ~~Olivier Sylvain~~

Alex McHill

Want to participate.

Woman of Vision

want to travel abroad

- 1st half of Oct

Jill Rose & final

honors to be considered

- Kai Bird

328-7141 1 hr

int - this week?

of 1945,

+ by all Agent 3 texts of another weapons
were conducted - 2 of the - greatest population
centres - ~~resisting~~ demonstrating to all
posturing everything that was have ever really
needed to know about nuclear weapons for the
purpose of arriving at appropriate Abo
nuclear policy: 1) that ~~small quantities~~ the atomic weapon
U-235 or Pu-239 could produce explosion with
^{greater} 1000 x the power of the largest chain bombs
of WWII; and (2) that ~~losses~~ men in power - in
a democratic state - ~~would~~ were were willing, - at
least some circumstances [(just how Nagasaki + his
top advisers saw their circumstances and the belief is
the decision is still being controversial) to use these
bombs to kill, ^{in a flash} hundreds of thousands of people.

* (The following anthology and this has led us
to understand the risks of the possession of
was of "powerful, destructive" (or at least, finally to
the US) governments; but it may also have natural
those risks below what they would be if a true
historical event had been published and the
decision had universitas be accepted by the public.)

(Higher than of those had been a true event,
leading to confirmation and greater confidence in the
usefulness. If + Pres. freedom).

[Dale bst — or his advisor — drew the lesson from by 1945 that the public did — that the Bomb had ended the war [Churchill claimed to believe this; did he?] , that it had been necessary ^{for this, to} to start invasion, that it had the same lesson

or did they just fail to believe this, to justify use, and to justify military support for future reliance on it, instead of revising it banned (after WWII)?

"Revisonists" imply (but don't usually say) that officials did not draw the same lesson / myth as public about the need for, or importance of, the Bomb in WWII.

If we subject to false expectations about further value: but not subject to public illusion about present effectiveness of value (coming after US bombing, or top of US conventional cap., blockade, and etc).

3?
Worth \$2B -
WWI?:

(except to cover the necessary shift in monetary time; and effort of so many...)

// Value of Bomb wrt. WWII ≈ 0 .

(But, the actual value of WWII would be great; though the war disrupted in fall 1945-46.)

Value in explaining ending was significant, to hot, Syria, confirmed" - '48; not again till '53 (the UK knew)

How often have
Pros' fault been
half voluntary?

helpful? neutral?

55 = 58? (62.5nd 7)(by some)(N.Y.) DIVISION
still. Years of policy, e.g. weapons Berlin '61? BULL. DDP OF GERMAN

25 Jan 95

E.C.

Kids about Hiroshima

- are not the worst of myths to be believed, & accepted as justification
- other than if truth were accepted
- Then all USG threats would not be necessary as bluffs
 - or be kept secret (less, less credible)
- they will be seen by US public & ^{foreign} advisors as credible,
ensure they would be acceptable
(aside from risk of actual.)

- weapons would have been used;
at DBP? (But, French...)

- Laos '61-62

- VN

- KOREA (ask: why not? why?)

- China civil war;
Taiwan Straits
(any boat mount?)

So McR is partly right - considerable misinformation,
after Nagasaki (not before). DUE TO MYTH?
OR?

Power

A

How does Power corrupt?

How does Dope (^{Venom} Crook) corrupt?

1) It addicts. (as does secret function)

Habituates

Makes one dependent

Requires bigger doors - to feel OK

Focuses attention, knows from us

2) It self - glorifies

crook, coke

aggrandizes

(less, gross! MDMA!

self-inflates

acid!

'the all'

- leads to identifying interests of self

(in position,
power)

image/adulation
adoration

(and life, comfort)

with the interests of a larger "body";

group notion
cause coop.

(which may give us the power)

- leads to discounting the importance, worth, of
others: subjects of one's power; less powerful
subordinates
(enemy civis (not, leaders!))

Laws/Crimes of 20th Century

Nicosia: when does it fit?

- (A) If ^{Nicosia} Mythe were true — would it be justified?
(weiss) (B) His "reality": ? / as most Americans believe

[If or were guilty: are his less justified?
what of lawyers? additional culpability?
friends?
blocks?

- Stimson / Court: Would Nicosia have been
justified/obligated if previous had been ^{from his class} different?

e.g. - 40,000 US cas.

- off to Emperor ^{pero} (S. 1948)

- SU ~~lets~~ a concession

- little concession

(His lies + omissions suggest not!)

and that lesson has had a effect (good!)

Wf did Britain object to case of A-Bomb in Korea?

Would they have done so in early 1949?

Before SU A-Bomb?

Would Stalin have OK'd invasion " " " ?!

Want of: DBP; Taiwan Straits?

Re. was there (law) determination of OS RV?